Remarks

In the non-final Office Action dated October 27, 2008, claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9-12, 15-17, and 21-24 are pending. All claims stand rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, and 15 in this Response. The Applicants traverse the rejections herein.

35 USC § 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9-11, 15-17, and 21-24 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 7,180,638 (Hou). The Applicants submit that the claims are novel in view of Hou.

Claim 1, paraphrased herein, recites a multifunction device. The multifunction device includes a communication module configured to communicate with a server over a network. The multifunction device additionally includes a controller module configured to control the operation of the multifunction device and to interface with business applications running on the server. The server provides business application interfaces to the multifunction device for the business applications running on the server. The multifunction device additionally includes a user interface module configured to present the business application interface on a display integral to the multifunction device and to allow a user to enter and receive data from the business application interfaces. The multifunction device additionally includes a source interface module configured to receive input data from at least one document data source. The controller module is further configured to transmit the input data from the at least one document data source and the user input to the business application executing on the server. The multifunction device additionally includes a target interface module configured to output the input data from the at least one document data source and the user input as processed document data.

First, the Applicants submit that Hou does not teach a multifunction device including a controller module "configured to interface with a business application executing on a server, and to present a business application interface on a display integral to the multifunction device, where the business application interface is for interfacing with the business application."

Hou discloses a network fax machine including an embedded web server. The network fax machine allows users to browse to the fax machine using a web browser executing on a remote computer to send a fax (Summary, FIG. 1). There is no teaching in Hou to suggest that

the fax machine is operable to present an application interface from a remote server on a display integral to the fax machine for interfacing with applications executing on the remote server. For example, Hou does not teach that the fax machine presents applications interfaces on a display integral to the fax machine for applications executing on a mail server 204 or proxy server 212 (See FIG. 2). In fact, the Applicants submit that Hou teaches away from providing a business application interface on a display integral to the fax machine. Hou discloses that users can utilize web clients from remote computers networked with the fax machine or even over the internet to send a fax. This remote functionality is in contrast to a conventional fax machine, which requires a user to physically carry the fax to the fax machine location (Background). In Hou, there is no teaching that the web browser functionality disclosed in FIG. 4 is available on a display integral to the fax machine.

Second, the Applicants submit that Hou does not teach that the control module is "further configured to transmit input data from a document and the user input to the business application executing on the server."

Hou discloses in FIG. 4 that a web browser on a client computer can "browse" to a web page generated by a web server within the fax machine for inputting data and sending a fax. The user can optionally enter data on the webpage (elements 402-410) and select a file for faxing (element 412). In Hou, user input is entered on a remote computer operating a web client for transmission to a web server within the fax machine. Thus, the fax machine does not "transmit" input data from a user and a document to an external server. Instead, the fax machine "receives" data and a document from a user from a remote computer.

The Applicants submit that for at least the reasons provided, that claim 1 is novel in view of Hou. Similar arguments apply for claim 15. Dependent claims 3, 5-6, 9-11, 16-17, and 21-24 are novel at least for depending on allowable base claims 1 and 15.

35 USC § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected dependent claim 12 as being unpatentable over Hou in further view of US Patent Number 5,361,136 (Hu). The Applicants submit that claim 12 is non-obvious for at least the reasons provided above.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9-12, 15-17, and 21-24 are novel in view of the cited art, and therefore respectfully request the Examiner allow claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9-12, 15-17, and 21-24.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 27, 2008   /Sean J. Varley/

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
Duft, Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)
Customer Number: 50441